

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-14 and 16-22 are pending in the application and stand rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 12-14, 16 and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Moriwake et al. (US 2003/0117431).

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a media file management unit that creates a **search window** that displays media files to be searched and **an edit window** that displays a media content file to be edited, when the media file is required to be edited, and searching and managing the media files through the search window or the edit window in accordance with the at least one control signal.

In the rejection, the Examiner relies on Moriwake's clip tree window 31 as corresponding to the recited search window. *See* Office Action, p. 2. As discussed in Moriwake, this clip tree window 31 is an area for displaying a graphic display to visually obtain the hierarchical relation of clips registered in the clip database. *See* Para. [0136].

Additionally, the Examiner cites to paragraph [0140] as a basis for asserting that Moriwake also discloses an edit window. The Examiner contends this portion of Moriwake discloses a clip presently being displayed to be edited. *See* Office Action, p. 2. However, this paragraph explains that "the clip whose clip name is surrounded by a frame with a bold line is a clip being displayed at present to be edited." *See* Para. [0140]. Further, as shown in FIG. 10, the clip labeled FC-008 is the clip having the frame with a bold line. Consequently, a frame having a bold line is displayed in the clip tree window 31. This is the same window identified by the Examiner above as corresponding to the recited search window.

Accordingly, Applicants submit these portions of Moriwake fail to disclose both a search window and an edit window. Rather, the functions attributable to the recited search window and edit window are associated with a single window, the clip tree window 31. In this regard, Moriwake fails to disclose both a search window and an edit window meeting the features recited in claim 1.

Thus, Applicants submit claim 1 is allowable for the reason set forth above. Additionally, Applicants submit claims 2, 5, 6 and 8 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency. Because claims 12 and 20 recite similar feature, Applicants submit these claims are allowable for the same reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1. Finally, Applicants submit claims 13-14, 16 and 21-22 are allowable by virtue of their dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 9-11, 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moriwake in view of Myers et al. (2001).

In response, Applicants submit that because Myers, either taken alone or in combination with Moriwake, fails to compensate for the above noted deficiencies of Moriwake as set forth above, claims 9-11, 18 and 19 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependencies.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moriwake in view of Myers et al. (2001) in further view of Chernock et al. (US 6,229,524).

In response, Applicants submit that because neither Myers nor Chernock, either taken alone or in combination with Moriwake, fails to compensate for the above noted deficiencies of Moriwake as set forth above, claim 4 is allowable, at least by virtue of their dependencies.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 7 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moriwake in view of Myers et al. (2001).

In response, Applicants submit that because Myers, either taken alone or in combination with Moriwake, fails to compensate for the above noted deficiencies of Moriwake as set forth above, claims 7 and 17 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependencies.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/David P. Emery/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 23, 2009

David P. Emery
Registration No. 55,154